UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,879	08/22/2001	Heather N. Bean	10015216-1	9258

7590 06/17/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HUYNH, BA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	2

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/934,879	BEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ba Huynh	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10,12-21,23,24 and 29-41 is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) 3-6, 9, 11, 22, 25-28 is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2001 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1.
4) ☑ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 20, 23, 24, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent #6,574,416 (Posa et al).

- As for claims 1, 2, 20: Posa et al teach a computer implemented method and corresponding system for displaying a video sequence, the video sequence comprises a plurality of video segments, each video segment is concurrently displayed in a corresponding window (abstract; 1:54-59; figure 2). Each video segment is displayed with a time offset (1:59-67). Each segment can be selected independently to play its video and associated audio (2:1-7).
- As for claim 7: The number of video windows and their spatial configuration on the display are specified by a user prior to step (a) (1:59-67).
- As for claim 8: The time offset is specified by the user prior to step (a) (1:59-67).
- As for claim 10: The predetermined time offset is an interger multiple of time differential (1:62-65).

- As for claims 12, 13, 23, 24: The selecting the video window comprises positioning a cursor over the window and activating a pointing device (10:22-26).
- As for claims 18, 31: The number of video windows are chosen such that to over substantially all of the video sequence in the windows (1:54-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-17, 19, 21, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #6,574,416 (Posa et al).

- As for claims 14, 15, 29, 30: Posa et al fail to clearly teach that a selected window is displayed larger than the others. However Official notice is taken that implementation of a selected window larger than other non-selected window is well known in the art for providing a visual cue indicating the window in focus. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the well known implementation of displaying the selected window larger than other non-selected window to Posa et al. Motivation of the combining is for providing a visual cue indicating the window in focus. While being enlarged, the window is moved to a different display coordinates.

- As for claims 16, 17, 21: Marking a selected window, such highlighting and bordering, are basic window operations thus are inherently included in Posa's teaching of window. Even if it is not, official notice is taken that implementation of marking a selected window by highlighting or bordering to differentiate it from other windows are well known in the art for providing a visual cue indicating the window in focus. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the well known implementation of marking a selected window to differentiate it from other windows to Posa et al. Motivation of the combining is for providing a visual cue indicating the window in focus.

5. Claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Posa et al as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of US patent #6,650,826 (Hatta).

- As for claims 19: The segment windows can be played simultaneously together with its associated audio (10:32-55). However Posa et al fail to clearly teach that the windows are simultaneously selected and replayed under the control of the user. However, in analogous art of video indexing, Hatta teaches the implementation of user control for simultaneously selecting and replaying of video segments in associated windows (1: 34-44; 2:59-67;7:7-12; figure 5). Thus it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Hatta's teaching of control for simultaneously selecting and replaying of video segments in associated windows to Posa et al. Motivation of the combining is for

concurrently viewing and controlling the viewing of the video as explicitly suggested by Hata (1:34-44; 2:59-67).

6. Claims 32-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Posa et al.

In an interview on 6/1/04 for a propose restriction requirement based on process and apparatus claims, Mr. Thomas M. Croft traverses the restriction and indicates that the apparatus claims are merely one to one mapping of the corresponding method claims. Thus claims 32-41 are rejected as either being anticipated or in the alternative obvious over Posa et al, in light of the rejetion set forth in the method claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3-6, 9, 11, 22, 25-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art of record fails to clearly teach the following limitations as recited in the claims 3-6, 9, 11, 22, 25-28, when each of the claims are considered as a whole: resetting the predetermined time offset relative to the stored time index (claims 3-6, 25-28), adjusting the time differential while the video is displayed (claims 9, 11, 22).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9794. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cabeca John can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ba Huynh
Primary Examiner
AU 2173
6/13/04

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER